	Case 2:02-cr-00416-TLN Document 4	04 Filed 06/07/22 Page 1 of 2
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	No. 2:02-cr-00416-TLN
12	Plaintiff,	
13	v.	ORDER
14	DAWANE ARTHUR MALLETT,	
15	Defendant.	
16		
17	This matter is before the Court on Defendant Dawane Arthur Mallett's ("Defendant")	
18	Motion to Modify the Restitution Order. (ECF No. 403.) No opposition has been filed. For the	
19	reasons set forth below, the Court DENIES Defendant's motion.	
20	Defendant is a federal prisoner proceeding <i>pro se</i> . In 2003, Defendant was convicted of	
21	two counts of aiding and abetting interference with commerce by robbery in violation of 18	
22	U.S.C. § 1951(a)(2); two counts of use of a firearm in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 924(c); one count	
23	of aiding and abetting armed bank burglary and kidnapping in violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 2113(a),	
24	(d), and (e); and one count of aiding and abetting carjacking a vehicle that has been transported in	
25	interstate commerce in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 2119. (ECF No. 239.) On February 6, 2004,	
26	Defendant was sentenced to 654 months in federal prison. (ECF No. 258.) The Court also	
27	ordered Defendant to pay a special assessment in the amount of \$600 and restitution in the	
28	amount of \$1,844.83. ( <i>Id</i> .)	
		1

## Case 2:02-cr-00416-TLN Document 404 Filed 06/07/22 Page 2 of 2

Defendant filed the instant *pro se* motion on May 16, 2022. (ECF No. 403.) Defendant raises various arguments, including that he is unable to make any payments of restitution, that the \$600 special assessment fee has expired, and that there is no Court-ordered payment plan. (*Id.*) The Court construes Defendant's motion as one to modify the restitution order. However, Defendant's arguments lack clarity, and the Court declines to modify the well-supported special assessment and restitution order based on the existing record. To the extent Defendant has questions about his remaining financial obligations, Defendant should raise those questions with the Bureau of Prisons.

Accordingly, the Court DENIES Defendant's motion. (ECF No. 403.) IT IS SO ORDERED.

**DATED:** June 6, 2022

Troy L. Nunley

United States District Judge